

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
ROBERT COBHAM,

Plaintiff,

-against-

**ORDER**

22-CV-00456 (JMA) (ARL)

THE NEW YORK RACING ASSOCIATION, INC., et al

Defendant.  
-----X

**AZRACK, United States District Judge:**

Before the Court is pro se Plaintiff Robert Cobham’s motion for reconsideration of the Court’s order, dated February 11, 2022, denying his motion for a temporary restraining order (“TRO”). (ECF No. 10.) Having reviewed the Plaintiff’s submission (ECF No. 13,) the motion must be denied, because he has not raised any facts or caselaw that was not previously considered by the Court. See Rollins v. N.Y. State Div. of Parole, No. 03-CV-5952, 2007 WL 539158, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 16, 2007) (“A motion for reconsideration may be granted only if a court overlooked (1) factual matters that were put before it on the underlying motion or (2) controlling legal authority.”); see, also, Goldner v. Edwards, No. 20-CIV-2764, 2020 WL 1812740, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 9, 2020) (denying reconsideration of application for TRO where plaintiff identified no matter or controlling authority overlooked by the court). “[E]ven though Plaintiff is pro se, such status does not exempt a party from compliance with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law.” Id. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962).

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 14, 2022  
Central Islip, New York

\_\_\_\_\_/s/ JMA\_\_\_\_\_  
JOAN M. AZRACK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE